

Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 6561 Case file # 95-260456.

Material Examiner: Malone (RQ)

Remarks:

Case resulted in a trial, testimony transcript not provided.

Crm 147

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fibers

Review commenced at: 10:45 AM (Time), 11/06/01 (Date)

File #: 95-260456

Laboratory #(s): 40329004

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed	Reviewed	Not Reviewed
<u>RQ</u>	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>VI</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u> </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: none available

Testimony Date(s): _____ Pages: _____

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 403290004 Date: June 18, 1984

Laboratory Number: _____ Date: _____

Laboratory Number: _____ Date: _____

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ and unknown technician

Laboratory Number: 40329004

Page 1 of 3

Initials: SR

CRM147A

Was any other material reviewed? Yes No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: submitting agency letter dated 3-22-84

Results of Review

File #: 95-260456 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1-Q7, Q10, Q17-Q25, Q27,

K3, K4, K6, K7

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?
 Yes No Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?
 Yes No Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

Transcript not available.

- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? Yes No Unable to Determine
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? Yes No Unable to Determine
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? Yes No Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 3

Initials: SMA

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-260456

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, one cannot determine from the notes that the examination was conducted in an appropriate manner.

#2: Documentation is poor. The notes are not dated and are in pencil and not ink. Abbreviations are used to describe the microscopic characteristics of the hair. These abbreviations are difficult to interpret. There is no documentation by the technician that hair was recovered from Q1 or Q2 as stated in the report. The report states "One brown pubic hair of Caucasian origin was found in specimen Q27. This hair microscopically matches the pubic hair of the victim." The examiner's notes for item Q27, the suspect' pubic combings, read "Q27- Sev b P.H's C.O=K6(s) *1 b P.H CO F. rem = K6(s) ^{*SEE} ~~K3(v)~~". These notes indicate that more than one public hair was recovered from Q27. In addition, these notes indicate that one hair from Q27 matches the suspect's pubic hair sample (K6) instead of the victim's pubic hair sample (K3).

Review completed at: 11:30 AM (Time), 11/06/01 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0.75 hr.

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Roberts 11/06/2001
(Signature) (Date)

* For CLARIFICATION, THIS READS "~~=~~ K3 (v)", MEANING THIS HAIR DOES NOT MATCH THE K3 SAMPLE. *SUR*

Page 3 of 3

Initials: *SUR*